

REMARKS

I. Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-39 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arora (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023111) in view of Fisher (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,858).

Claims 1, 14, and 27 are independent.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action rejects independent claims 1, 14, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arora in view of Fisher.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Arora and Fisher, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... resizing the selected image to fit the designated subspace of the composite image”

as set forth in each of claims 1, 14, and 27 (emphasis added).

The Office Action apparently contends that such is taught via Arora’s discussion of “the image boundary resiz[ing] to fit a user specified image” at paragraph [0109].

However, Applicants respectfully observe that such discussion by Arora fails, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest any resizing of an image, and instead merely deals with resizing a boundary:

“[w]hen the user clicks on Image tool 384, page draw editor 120 allows the user to specify an image display element. Unlike the text boundary, the image boundary resizes to fit a user-specified image. Once the image has been added to the display, the user can create a link on all or part of the image

or select one color in the image as transparent”
(see Arora paragraph [0109]; emphasis added).

Applicants believe it clear, for instance, that resizing a boundary to fit an image is not at all like “... resizing the selected image to fit the designated subspace ...” as set forth in each of claims 1, 14, and 27.

Should the Office Action be pointing to Arora’s statement that:

“[t]he user can also change the size of the image using the cursor”
(see Arora paragraph [0109]),

Applicants respectfully submit that such statement fails, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest that the size of the image is changed to fit a designated subspace of a composite image, and instead merely discusses arbitrary image resizing by a user.

Applicants, as discussed in the response to the last Office Action, note that paragraph [0147] of Arora fails, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest resizing a selected image to fit the “area for each field”, and instead discusses merely “siz[ing]” the “area for each field” itself.

Moreover, Applicants note that paragraph [0103] of Arora merely indicates that:

“FIG. 11(c) shows a Layout pull-down menu, which includes an Align Objects function that horizontally, vertically, or centrally aligns display elements, a Center Objects function that centers display elements, a Size Objects function that sizes display elements, an Element Script function, and a Layout script function”
(see Arora paragraph [0103]).

Arora fails, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest that the “Size Objects function” deals with resizing a selected image to fit a designated subspace.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 14, and 27, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

III. Dependent Claim Rejections

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

(Continued on next page)

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this submission, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4301-4000. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:



Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Dated: September 5, 2006

Mailing Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)